

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Telephone Interview

The Applicant would like to thank Examiner Herrera for granting and conducting a telephone interview on January 18, 2011.

During the interview the limitations of claim 1 were discussed in detail. After discussing the limitations of claim 1, the Examiner explained his position that because claim 1 recites “presenting,” rather than “transmitting,” he can broadly interpret the claim to read on a simple caller ID device that will not present certain information to a viewer, as well as to read on Demsky.

In view of the above, the Examiner suggested amending claim 1 to (1) clarify that the presentation attribute indicates whether or not the personal information is permitted to be transmitted to the second communication terminal, (2) clarify that the personal information determination section determines whether or not the personal information is permitted to be transmitted based on the indication of the presentation attribute, (3) clarify that the personal information presentation section transmits the personal information only when the presentation attribute indicates that the personal information is permitted to be transmitted, and (4) clarify that the personal information presentation section prohibits the communication section from transmitting the personal information when the presentation attribute indicates that the personal information is not permitted to be transmitted.

The Examiner kindly agreed that Demsky does not appear to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned clarifications (1)-(4).

II. Amendments to the Claims

In view of the above-mentioned interview, independent claims 1, 10 and 12 have been amended based on the suggested clarifications (1)-(4). Further, dependent claims 2-4 have been amended to remain consistent with amended independent claim 1.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-4, 9, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Parker (GB 2391759) and Demsky (U.S. 7,107,317). Further, claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Parker, Demsky and Emerson (U.S. 2003/0043974). In addition, claims 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Parker, Demsky and Harada (U.S. 2003/0007640). These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1, 10 and 12 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a communication terminal for communicating with a first communication terminal and a second communication terminal via telephone or electronic mail. In addition, claim 1 recites that the communication terminal includes a communication section for receiving, from the first communication terminal, (i) personal information of the first communication terminal, the personal information of the first communication terminal including at least a telephone number of the first communication terminal or an electronic mail address of the first communication terminal, and (ii) a presentation attribute that indicates whether or not

the personal information of the first communication terminal is permitted to be transmitted to the second communication terminal. Further, claim 1 recites that the communication terminal includes a personal information determination section for determining, based on the indication of the presentation attribute, whether or not the personal information of the first communication terminal is permitted to be transmitted to the second communication terminal. Lastly, claim 1 recites that the communication terminal includes a personal information presentation section for (i) transmitting the personal information of the first communication terminal to the second communication terminal only when the personal information determination section determines that the presentation attribute indicates that the personal information is permitted to be transmitted to the second communication terminal, and (ii) prohibiting the communication section from transmitting the personal information of the first communication terminal to the second communication terminal when the personal information determination section determines that the presentation attribute indicates that the personal information is not permitted to be transmitted to the second communication terminal.

Initially, the Applicant notes that Demsky was relied upon for teaching the features of the presentation attribute, the personal information determination section and the personal information presentation section, as previously recited claim 1. However, in view of the above-mentioned amendments to claim 1, which further clarify the structure of the presentation attribute, the personal information determination section and the personal information presentation section, it is submitted that Demsky now fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features required by claim 1.

Rather, Demsky merely teaches determining, for each terminal of transmission destinations, whether or not viewing of information transmitted by the transmission source is

restricted at the terminal, such that, when information is presented from a source terminal to other terminals, the display of the information for each “other” terminal is restricted on a terminal-by-terminal basis (see Figs. 2 and 3, and col. 7, lines 4, 5, 18-23 and 30-35).

Thus, in view of the above and as discussed during the interview, Demsky merely teaches determining for each terminal of transmission destinations, whether or not viewing of information transmitted by the transmission source is restricted at the terminal, but fails to disclose or suggest that the presentation attribute (received from the first communication terminal) indicates whether or not the personal information of the first communication terminal is permitted to be transmitted to the second communication terminal, such that the personal information determination section determines, based on the indication of the presentation attribute, whether or not the personal information of the first communication terminal is permitted to be transmitted to the second communication terminal, and such that the personal information presentation section (i) transmits the personal information of the first communication terminal to the second communication terminal only when the personal information determination section determines that the presentation attribute indicates that the personal information is permitted to be transmitted to the second communication terminal, and (ii) prohibits the communication section from transmitting the personal information of the first communication terminal to the second communication terminal when the personal information determination section determines that the presentation attribute indicates that the personal information is not permitted to be transmitted to the second communication terminal, as recited in claim 1.

Put another way, even though Demsky teaches that, when information is presented from a source terminal to other terminals, the display of the information for each “other” terminal is

restricted on a terminal-by-terminal basis, Demsky still fails to disclose or suggest (i) transmitting the personal information of the first communication terminal to the second communication terminal only when the personal information determination section determines that the presentation attribute indicates that the personal information is permitted to be transmitted to the second communication terminal, and (ii) prohibiting the communication section from transmitting the personal information of the first communication terminal to the second communication terminal when the personal information determination section determines that the presentation attribute indicates that the personal information is not permitted to be transmitted to the second communication terminal, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 1 and claims 2-9 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Parker and Demsky.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Parker and/or Demsky or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Parker and/or Demsky to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 2-9 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Regarding the Emerson and Harada references, the Applicant notes that Emerson was only relied upon for teaching the features of dependent claim 8 and that Harada was only relied upon for teaching the features of dependent claims 5-7. However, Emerson and Harada fail to disclose or suggest the above-noted features of claim 1 that are lacking from the Parker and Demsky references. As a result, by virtue of their dependence on claim 1, claims 5-8 would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Parker, Demsky, Emerson and/or Harada.

Amended independent claims 10 and 12 are directed to a method and a program, respectively and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 10 and 12 are allowable over the prior art of record.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kazuyuki KASHIWABARA

By /Andrew L. Dunlap/
2011.02.04 12:34:42 -05'00'
Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicant

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
February 4, 2011